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Although the main problems with test ban treaty monitoring involve improving methods for discrimination of source types, there are certain problems of continuing interest in the field of yield estimation. In terms of short period body waves and the dependence of m on yield, these involve the effects of anelastic attenuation, P, nonlinear phenomena such as spall and the influence of 3D structure on amplitude. A related problem involves the transportability of yield scaling relations between sites in different tectonic settings. We have carried out a number of studies directed at solving these problems. Much of the work has been presented in previous reports, but common themes among the studies are the use of a waveform analysis technique called intercorrelation and a focus on the use of the newly released data from internal Soviet stations. The first study reported here concerns the use of the intercorrelation approach on the onset of regional P waves to estimate yield. The yield dependence of the source time functions can be clearly observed and measured in the data. The importance of the method is that it provides a yield estimate based on an entirely new type of information (the waveform of the onset of Pp), and it is the type of information available from very small events at short distances. These are the types of data most crucial in the current treaty monitoring environment.

The second study is an examination of broad-band yield scaling laws from all U.S. test sites and a correlation with them of results from Soviet sites. The important off-test-site events, GASBUGGY, RULISON and FAULTLESS are considered. The third section considers trade-offs between yield estimation and Q for regional and far-regional data from the newly opened stations at GARM, ARU, OBN and KIV.
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DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 4
INTRODUCTION

The scope of the project includes a number of separate specialized investigations directed at solving problems associated with yield estimation utilizing short and long period body waves. We here present the results of our research on three of them. In terms of short period body waves, these problems involve the effects of anelastic attenuation, pP and nonlinear effects such as spall on seismic amplitude and on mb. In a portion of the work, we have developed an entirely new approach to yield estimation. In another we have investigated the transportability of yield scaling laws from site to site, considering both U.S. and Soviet testing areas. We also have performed studies on the effects of regional and teleseismic Q on attempts at estimating explosion source strength.

The first study which is reported on is an attempt to generalize the relative waveform analysis procedure called intercorrelation, to regional teleseismic Pn waves. This approach has been used almost exclusively to analyze teleseismic data in the past. There is a current need to characterize the behavior and uncertainty in magnitude-yield relations down to body wave magnitudes which are as small as possible. Of course, the seismic data with good signal to noise ratios for such small events will be restricted to regional distances. It has recently come to light that the Pn waveform in the western U.S. is highly stable and that it shows a strong variation with event size. Intercorrelation has been used to measure source function scaling for well coupled events below the water table down to magnitude 3.9. It has been established in a number of separate studies by many investigators that the behavior of pP from nuclear tests is not consistent with elastic reflection from a simple point compressional source. Direct observation of isolated pPn appears to confirm this. Because of the relatively low attenuation of Pn with respect to teleseismic P, it is possible to isolate the direct Pn arrival from pPn. The parameters of the source time function can be studied independently from this data using the intercorrelation approach. It was found that the relative yield of events could be reliably determined from the direct Pn wave shapes alone using the method.
The second investigation we have undertaken is a study of the broad-band nature of seismic signals from explosions. We examine both long period and short period types of information in an attempt to develop yield scaling laws which are highly transportable. Along with the usual short period body waves on which standard mb-yield curves are based, we consider such information as long period P, long period PS and near field signals. We consider all the U.S. test sites including those of GASBUGGY, RULISON and FAULTLESS, which are essentially single event sites and the NTS and Amchitka testing areas. We correlate our results with those from the Soviet test site at Shagan River.

Though the new internal seismic data from the Soviet Union is exciting and very significant to the yield estimation process, it is still relatively sparse and the familiar problems of trade-offs between Q and explosion source strength emerge. We have undertaken two unusual studies of Q, one involving regional data and the other far regional to teleseismic data. In the former, we examine Pnl data from the Soviet station at GARM and compare it to similar data from the U.S. station at Harvard. In the latter, we consider broad-band data from Soviet stations KIV, OBN and ARU.
INTERCORRELATION OF REGIONAL Pn

The first study we will discuss is an attempt to take advantage of some recent observations made by Burdick et al. (1991c) regarding the waveform of the onset of regional Pn. It appears clear that these waveforms are very directly comparable to those of teleseismic P. Rather than being true head waves, these arrivals seem to be turning rays in the uppermost mantle above the low velocity zone. At short times, they can be represented as a simple convolution of a source, Q and instrument operator just as teleseismic short period P can. However, because they never penetrate the low velocity zone, the effect of attenuation is tremendously reduced. Instead of \( t'' \) having a value of approximately 1.0 s, as it does for teleseismic P from NTS, it has a value close to 0.1s; an order of magnitude change in the exponential. This allows the direct P to be separated from the pP through simple time domain windowing.

Before discussing the regional Pn yield scaling behavior, we will review the procedure known as waveform intercorrelation. It is a method which allows the reduction of the observations of many events at a common test site to source models for the events. The source models are parameterized mathematical functions which describe the reduced displacement potential and, for teleseismic data, a representation for the free surface interaction and perhaps even spall. The RDP representation is typically an explicit function of yield with the free parameters defined in terms of yield scaling laws. The changes in the shape of the RDP for events at a common site are thus related to changes in yield. The key advancement in this study is that the free surface parameters can be neglected. The most important goal is to attempt to estimate yield directly from the evolution of the shape of the Pn onset.

The classic intercorrelation procedure is illustrated in Figure 1. Each seismogram from a given event is convolved with the source function and a spike train representing P and pP from another event. The seismograms from the other event are convolved with the P+pP spike train and parameterized RDP from the first event. The two intercorrelation waveforms at each station are then analytically compared to each other and the source functions that produce the best waveform
Figure 1. An Illustration of the standard intercorrelation procedure. The left column shows two teleseismic short period P waveforms from a common test site at a common station. The center column shows source estimates for each event paired with the signals from the opposite event. The source estimates are described in terms of both a source time function and pP reflection. The cross-paired sources and records are convolved and the resultants equalized in a grid search operation using an analytic norm. The results for this case are shown on the right. In the new procedure used here, the pP phase is windowed out and only the source parameters are searched for.
match are found. The procedure is applied to all possible matching stations simultaneously. In this instance, these are two Novaya Zemlya events as observed at station ATL. The equalization of the two dissimilar waveforms on the left after the intercorrelation procedure is very good as shown on the right.

To incorporate differences in event yields, it is necessary to adopt a parameterized description of the explosion source. Such parameterizations are abundant in the literature (Murphy, 1977; von Seggern and Blandford, 1972; Heimberger and Hadley, 1981). Here we adopt the Murphy (1977) source representation and yield scaling though we emphasize that the other two are equally valid and would perform as well if need be. The intercorrelation waveforms for each station pair are typically compared using one or two norms. The waveform norm is given by

$$N_N = \frac{1}{n} \sum (1 - CCC)$$

CCC is the normalized cross correlation coefficient and n is the number of stations. This norm is most sensitive to differences in zero crossing times and is often used in waveform inversion studies. Absolute amplitude information is typically retained using a standard least squares norm if need be, but in this investigation we have utilized only the waveform norm.

Over the past few decades the state of digital-broad-band seismic recording has gone through a major revolution. Fortunately for the endeavor of test ban treaty monitoring, many of the highest quality stations were located in the western U.S. where they recorded many NTS nuclear events. Figure 2 is a map of the stations from which we have assembled the data base we have used in this work. The stations shown were installed over a substantial period of time and illustrate the development of digital seismic recording. The ones which were installed first were DWWSSN stations ALQ and JAS. Recording was and is made in several pass-bands and is available on the standard Network Day Tapes. The four LLNL stations, MNV, ELK, KNB and LAC represent a major upgrade in recording capability because they are broad-band with a wide dynamic range. (We note that there were important analog stations at these same sites decades in the past.) The
Figure 2. The western U.S. digital array as defined for the purpose of this study. MNV, KNB, LAC and ELK are LLNL stations. ALQ and JAS are DWWSSN stations, and PAS and PFO are university run stations. The open circles are the location of earthquakes in the discrimination data base.
two stations PAS and PFO have state-of-the-art Streckeisen instruments which are the same as those used in the IRIS net. The important point in terms of his study is that they all record regional Pn and have provided an ample data base for this investigation.

The concept of using the intercorrelation methodology to measure yield from the onset of regional Pn is not without foundation. In a recent work, Burdick et al. (1991c) showed that this onset was simple, stable and easy to interpret in terms of the standard concepts used to analyze teleseismic short period P waves. Figure 3 shows some of the typical data from the Burdick et al. (1991c) study. Observed deconvolved velocity waveforms from 4 Yucca Flat events as recorded at digital station MNV are shown in solid line. Almost 1.5 orders of magnitude are represented between the largest and smallest events. The frequency difference between them is clear even in the time domain. Synthetics computed using the Murphy (1977) source and an assumption of elastic pP behavior are shown as dashed lines. The observed and predicted pP arrivals are indicated by arrows. The observed pPn arrivals are late and close to the elastic predictions in size, but in any case, in this representation it is simple to window out the distinct direct Pn arrival. In passing, we note that these observations lend additional credence to the intercorrelation results as opposed to spectral averaging results. We also note that the Murphy (1977) predictions of change in frequency content between the largest and smallest event are not satisfactory. The predicted changes in time function are less extreme than the observed. The data available from LLNL is limited, but in reviewing it we did find signals from eleven Yucca Flat events below the water table. Figure 4 compares the waveforms at common LLNL stations for the smallest and the largest, BORREGO (mb = 3.9) and JORNADA (mb = 5.9). The change in frequency content at all stations is dramatic. Under each complete Pn trace is a windowed trace where the window is a trapezoid with an 0.5 s lead a 1.0 s level beginning at estimated onset time and an 0.5 second fall. There are clearly waveform differences between the stations, particularly at ELK, but the principle of intercorrelation is to characterize the changes in waveshape at fixed stations allowing for the possibility of complex path effects. The window should allow good spectral measurements up to frequencies of 1 hz.
Figure 3. An illustration of the Pn waveform observations which motivate this study. Observed waveforms are shown as solid lines and synthetics as dashed. The pPn is a downward pulse as indicated by an arrow in both the data and the synthetics. The pPn is delayed in the observations and can be windowed out. This permits intercorrelation analysis of the isolated direct arrival.
Figure 4. An illustration of the windowing procedure. The top trace shows the initial pulse. It is windowed with a trapezoid with an 0.5 s rise, an 0.75 s level time commencing at estimated arrival time and an 0.5 s fall. The removal or at least strong reduction of the pPn is apparent.
The procedure for intercorrelation has been presented in many previous reports (Burger et al., 1986, Lay et al., 1984a, Lay, 1985, 1991). As discussed above, the basic idea is to choose a reference event and an estimated source function for that event. If the signal includes pP, then pP parameters must also be included, but in this case, only direct Pn is present. We selected BORREGO and used the Murphy (1977) source. The procedure is then to find a source function for each other event which minimizes the differences between waveforms when a cross-convolution is performed. Since the depth of these events is known, the only free parameter is yield, and we simply stepped through yield values to find those for the non-reference events which optimized the waveform norm. The yield of BORREGO was estimated to be 0.7 kt from the scaling relation of Yacoub (1984) based on WWSSN records (Network AA) of Pahute and Yucca events below the water table. Figure 5 shows an additional unprocessed example for BORREGO and BOUSCHET which are also Yucca Flat events below the water table. This pairing of events is quite remarkable since they had identical depths. The shift in frequency content is quite clear, and because the depths are identical, it is almost certainly due to yield scaling. Figure 6 shows the results of the intercorrelation of those two events. The fits are quite remarkable in this example. It should also be noted that we are cross correlating waveforms from events differing by two orders of magnitude in size. The match of the complexity at ELKO is worth special recognition, and it would seem to indicate that the intercorrelation approach accounts for complex site effects as it was designed to do.

Figures 7 and 8 show similar initial and intercorrelated results for Yucca events above the water table. The reference event was selected as CORREO and the test event was TENAJA. In general, it seems best to select the smallest events for reference, perhaps because they have the richest frequency content. That is to say that for the largest events, the high frequency information is washed out. The complexity of the ELKO station is still apparent and the equalized records for that station are comparable for events above and below the water table. The assembly of a data base for Pahute Mesa events below the water table is problematical since only a few have
Figure 5. These are sample observations from one of the events in the data base of Yucca Flat events below the water table. The reference event on the right (BORREGO) had a depth of 564 m but a magnitude of only 3.9. BOUSCHET had a magnitude of 5.7 at the same depth. The shift in frequency content due to yield dependent variation in the source function is clear. Since it can be readily observed it can be quantified through intercorrelation analysis.
Figure 6. These are the intercorrelated signals shown in unprocessed form in Figure 5. The waveforms have been clearly equalized. The yield of the reference event was estimated at 0.7 kt from a standard NTS mb - yield relationship. The yield of BOUSCHET was estimated at 80 kt.
Figure 7. These are illustrative waveforms from the data base of Yucca Flat events above the water table. The events are shallower than those in the previous example, so windowing out of pP is less effective. The reference event selected for the analysis of this data base was CORREO with a depth of 335 m and a magnitude of 4.8. In this example TENAJA has a depth of 357 m and a magnitude of 4.5.
Figure 8. These are the intercorrelated signals shown in unprocessed form in Figure 7. The waveforms have again been effectively equalized using only the source function in the intercorrelation. The yield of the reference event was estimated at 9.4 kt. The yield of TENAJA was estimated at 10 kt.
been detonated since the threshold test ban agreement of 150 kt. In the data base available from
the LLNL digital stations, only two such events were recorded. To perform a partially legitimate
test of our approach, we again selected BORREGO (Yucca Flat below the water table) as a reference
event. Figure 9 shows the raw signals and Figure 10 shows the intercorrelation for event TOWANDA.
The equalization of the waveforms is remarkable and the unusual complexity of the ELKO record
persists. Finally, Figures 11 and 12 show samples of the raw data and intercorrelations for Pahute
events above the water table. The reference is KAPPELI and the test event is HOSTA. The
procedure again appears successful.

As discussed above, we applied intercorrelation analysis to all the events available in our
data base to predict the yield scaling behavior and to compare it to expected results. We review
here exactly how the analysis proceeds once the relative yield has been determined. There are two
basic goals in the structure of the analysis. The first is simply to estimate a yield for the master
event. The second and much more important goal is to loosely relate our results to the widely
accepted rules for yield scaling. There is little debate regarding the $m_b$-yield scaling relationships
for events larger than 100 kt at NTS. From several possible choices, we selected the scaling law
of Yacoub (1984). We then accept either the ISC or LLNL body wave magnitude (ISC preferred)
for the master event. We then derive a yield for the master event from the Yacoub (1984) law.
From this point forward, the procedure is completely automated and depends only on the
intercorrelation analysis. Figure 13 shows the results for Yucca flat events below the water table.
The selected master event was BORREGO. The solid line in the graph is the Yacoub (1984) curve
and thus the master event falls directly on it. The other events scatter evenly about the predicted
curve. One of the events is JORNADA which is compared with BORREGO in Figure 4. The
implication is clear. The strong change in frequency content of direct $P_n$ in that figure is directly
related to yield. Furthermore, the large event scaling law appears to hold down to events as small
as BORREGO.
Figure 9. The waveforms on the left come from an event below the water table at Pahute Mesa. Only two events of almost identical size were available in the data base so BORREGO (Yucca below water table) was used as a reference as in Figure 5.
Figure 10. These are the intercorrelated signals shown in unprocessed form in Figure 9. The waveforms have again been effectively equalized using only the source function in the intercorrelation. The yield of the reference event was estimated at 0.7 kt and of TOWANDA at 24 kt.
Figure 11. These waveforms are from Pahute events above the water table. The magnitude of reference event KAPPELI is 5.2 and of test event HOSTA is 5.6.
Figure 12. These are the intercorrelated signals shown in unprocessed form in Figure 10. The waveforms have again been effectively equalized using only the source function in the intercorrelation. The yields of the reference event was estimated at 35 kt and of HOSTA at 24 kt.
Figure 13. A comparison of yield scaling predictions based on only intercorrelation analysis of Pn compared to a standard scaling law for NTS. In this case, the data base included Yucca events below the water table. The reference event was BORREGO.
Figure 14 shows the results for Yucca Flat events above the water table. In this case, the reference event was chosen as CORREO which is approximately in the middle of the \( m_b \) distribution. The reason for this choice is that CORREO has the most complete recorded data base, though it is true that the smallest master events tend to give the best intercorrelation results. CORREO is near the top of the population as it distributes about the standard yield-scaling line. The remarkable fact is that the slope of the population follows very closely the prediction of the Yacoub (1984) line. There is an open question as to whether there are changes in slope of this line as events become very small. The evidence here is that the slope does not change for events with yields as low as about 2 kt. Also note that the distribution of events is much more even than in Figure 13. There seems to be little difference in behavior for events above and below the water table.

Figure 15 shows the results for Pahute events below the water table. As noted previously, there have been few such tests in recent history. BORREGO from beneath the water table was arbitrarily selected as the master. The Yacoub (1984) prediction holds reasonably well although a small increase in slope may be indicated by the data points. Figure 16 shows the results for Pahute Mesa events above the water table. The master event was chosen as KAPPELI. In this instance, there appears to be an indication of a decrease in slope in the data points. However, the distribution in magnitudes is quite limited. Clearly, the analysis of more data with a greater range of magnitudes would be desirable in the future.

**Discussion:** The importance of these discoveries in terms of modern treaty monitoring is very substantial. Though there is clearly the need for much more investigation, the \( P_n \) onset method of estimating yields represents a fourth new seismic approach for doing so, and one that can be used for very small events. The three classic methods are to examine \( m_b \)-yield scaling, \( M_S \)-yield scaling or \( M_0 \)-yield scaling. The difference with the \( P_n \) onset approach is that it relies on wave shape changes as a function of yield as opposed to amplitude information, though the latter could certainly be incorporated into the procedure in the future. \( M_S \) scaling is generally simply a measure of the dependence of 20 second spectral amplitude on yield. Complete waveform information is
Figure 14. A comparison of yield scaling predictions based on only intercorrelation analysis of Pn compared to a standard scaling law for NTS. In this case, the data base included Yucca events above the water table. The reference event was CORREO.
Figure 15. A comparison of yield scaling predictions based on only intercorrelation analysis of Pn compared to a standard scaling law for NTS. There were only two events available from Pahute below the water table. The reference event used was BORREGO (Yucca below the water table).
Figure 16. A comparison of yield scaling predictions based on only intercorrelation analysis of $P_n$ compared to a standard scaling law for NTS. In this case, the data base included Yucca events above the water table. The reference event was KAPPELI. In this instance there appears to be some difference in slope between the intercorrelation measurements and the standard law.
not utilized. $M_0$ or moment scaling does utilize much more of the long period information, but both of these techniques suffer from serious difficulties at magnitudes less than 4.0. Body wave magnitude does depend on a single period measurement in that it scales as $\log(A/T)$, but it hardly utilizes complete waveform information. Furthermore, $m_b$-yield scaling is the most widely accepted approach to yield estimation, and in those magnitude ranges where both $m_b$ values and $P_n$ waveforms are available both methods give the same results.

There are many directions which need to pursued in the future regarding yield estimation from $P_n$ onset waveforms. The generality of the approach at alternate test sites remains a significant issue, though the physics of the approach are very simple and there is every reason to believe it will be transportable. The variability of the results with respect to events above and below the water table at Pahute Mesa is an important issue, but it can be investigated further by considering additional NTS events.
BROADBAND SOURCE MODELS FOR U.S. UNDERGROUND NUCLEAR EXPLOSIONS

Introduction: Recent broadband studies of earthquakes indicate considerable complexity and non-uniformity in source characteristics. Modern source descriptions are expressed in terms of seismic moment and asperity distribution on the fault surface. The latter is best established by studies of local strong-motion observations while the former can be obtained from teleseismic modeling of long-period body waves and surface waves. The recent deployment of the new IRIS systems consisting of the Weilandt-Strekeisen sensors and 24 bit Quanterra loggers allows the entire frequency band to be recorded and modeled locally (e.g., Dreger and Helmberger, 1990). Since smaller events can not be seen teleseismically, the new data systems become essential in studying both earthquake and explosion sources and in establishing techniques for discrimination. The broadband nature of underground nuclear sources is the key question in discrimination. Furthermore, the detailed variations in these source descriptions for various test sites in the U.S. and in foreign environments are also important. We will address these issues with respect to U.S. explosions and attempt to establish some useful kinematic source descriptions.

Source models and scaling relationships for underground explosions have been studied for several decades, but generally with an emphasis on comparing teleseismic data sets consisting of short-period $m_b$'s and long-period surface wave $M_S$'s. Classical amplitude measures on the $P$-wave such as $m_b$ can only take account of complicating factors such as attenuation, $pP$, and initial source histories in a crude fashion. Similar measures on surface waves ($M_S$) suffer from their own complicating factors such as effective attenuation, tectonic contamination and source coupling. It has been apparent for many years that these two yield estimators show distinct regional behavior, presumably caused by differences in the above factors. Figure 17a displays measurements taken from a sample of NTS and SRS events. The regression lines for these two regions indicate distinctly different trends. The separation of these populations is well established at the larger yields, as demonstrated in many studies (Sykes and Cifuentes, 1984; Given and Mellman, 1986).
Figure 17. (a) Plots of $m_b$ vs. $M_s$ regression curves for Shagan River, USSR, and NTS explosions (after Marshall et al., 1979). (b) Same regression curves as in (a) shown with Soviet PNE's and off-NTS explosions CANNIKIN, FAULTLESS, GASBUGGY, LONGSHOT, MILROW, and RULISON (indicated by the first letters of their names.)
Part of the scatter displayed in Figure 17a is caused by random effects and part is caused by deterministic factors which can be modeled and are correctable. Separating these two effects is fundamental to higher resolution attempts. Figure 17b shows the results of $m_b$ vs. $M_S$ comparisons for a sample of peaceful nuclear explosions. They show a great deal of variation which we can address to help isolate the deterministic elements of the source process and establish source properties.

Numerous papers have been written on why $m_b$ and $M_S$ values from Amchitka shots are different from those at Pahute. One of the earliest reports was given by Von Seggern (1972) who investigated the differences between BOXCAR (Pahute) and MILROW (Amchitka), two events of nearly the same yield. The $m_b$ for BOXCAR is nearly 0.3 units less than that of MILROW while the $M_S$ for BOXCAR is approximately 0.5 units larger than that of MILROW. He concluded that, since teleseismic $P$-waves from NTS are lower frequency than those from Amchitka, greater attenuation under NTS was the reason for the differences in $m_b$. He gave no explanation for the differences in $M_S$ between the two events. Similarly, the recent Joint Verification Experiment, involving shots of the same yield in the U.S. and USSR, showed a similar $m_b$ offset. This is generally believed to be caused by a difference in the attenuation beneath the two test sites. However, the $M_S$'s from Shagan River events which are the least contaminated by tectonic release (as indicated by the absence of Love waves) are roughly 0.3 to 0.5 units less than NTS events for events near the 150kt testing limit (Stevens, 1986). Sykes and Cifuentes (1984) used these same events to argue for Soviet compliance. These discrepancies suggest that the long-period source levels sampled by $M_S$ relative to the short-period levels sampled by $m_b$ are site-dependent and, thus, these differences can be used to establish some working broadband source models.

The approach followed here is similar to that of Lay et al. (1984b). We assume a convenient modified Haskell source representation given by

$$\Psi(t) = \Psi \left( 1 - e^{-\lambda t} \left( 1 + \lambda t + \frac{\lambda^2 t^2}{2} - B(\lambda t)^3 \right) \right)$$
where the RDP is defined by $\Psi(\tau)/R$. The reduced time $\tau$ is $\tau = \epsilon - (R/\alpha)$ where $R$ is the distance between the source and receiver and $\alpha$ is the velocity. The study by Mueller and Murphy (1971) established the basic scaling laws relating the constants $K$ and $\Psi_\infty$ to yield. Their formalism is easily adapted to the above RDP. The parameter $K$ is directly related to the corner frequency. The parameter $B$ controls the overshoot which provides the means to uncouple the short-period signals, used for the $m_b$ measurements, from the static level, which controls the $M_S$ measurement (Figure 18). Thus, allowing $B$ to vary provides the extra freedom in modeling extended data sets.

This study will address the determinations of the three constants, $K$, $B$ and $\Psi_\infty$ as a function of energy (yield) for the various U.S. test sites including the PNE's. We will begin with the simplest data set, Amchitka, followed by the most complex, NTS.

_Scaling Relationships at Amchitka_: The data set for Amchitka consists of near-in strong motion seismograms, and teleseismic seismograms containing body waves and surface waves (see Figure 19). In earlier efforts Burdick et al. (1984) and Lay et al. (1984a) established the linkage between these types of near-in data, Figure 19a, and the teleseismic short-period amplitudes. Their source models, while fitting the short-period data very well, do not fit the relative amplitudes of the Rayleigh waves given in Figure 19b. They predict CANNIKIN/MILROW long-period amplitude ratios of about 3 assuming $B=1$. The observed ratio is near 6. Note that the Amchitka events have negligible Love waves, so we would not expect to see any tectonic effects on the Rayleigh waves. The amplitude ratio of the observed long-period $P$-waves between these two events is about 2.8 which is not consistent with the short-period. The $M_S$'s from the Amchitka shots are 3.9 (LONGSHOT), 4.9 (MILROW), and 5.7 (CANNIKIN) (Liebermann and Basham, 1971; Willis et al., 1972) and fit the well known equation

$$M_S = \log Y + 2$$

which is an often quoted result.
Figure 18. Reduced displacement potentials (RDP) for a fixed $K (=6)$ and $V_{\infty}$ and various values of $B$ (1.00, 0.75, 0.50, 0.25, 0.00). This figure demonstrates how $B$ controls the degree of overshoot in RDPs.
Figure 19. Shown in the top panel is Amchitka Island and records from events CANNIKIN and MILROW. Three component velocity seismograms are presented along with the slant distances from event to station. Bottom panel shows long-period vertical $P$ and Rayleigh waves for CANNIKIN and MILROW at station DUG (Dugway, Utah). For MILROW the body wave is larger but for CANNIKIN the surface wave is larger.
Lay et al. (1984b) allowed $B$ to vary and resolved this discrepancy. We will review some of these efforts and modify the final scaling laws to better match absolute amplitude levels.

**Modelling Near-In Data:** About six good sets of strong motion records of the type displayed in Figure 19a are available for both MILROW and CANNIKIN. A crustal model was derived to fit the travel times of these records and many others. These crustal structures were further refined by matching the entire recorded waveform with the synthetic waveform (Burdick et al., 1984). The most stable portion of these observed-synthetic matches is the initial few seconds of motion as displayed in Figure 20a. The synthetic consists of the diving $P$ followed by the opposite in polarity pulse, $pP$ (see Vidale and Helmlberger, 1987, for details and the effects of 2D structures). However, since $pP$ cancels $P$ it becomes difficult to resolve all three parameters $B$, $K$, and $\psi_-$ because of the $\psi_-$ vs. $B$ trade-off, as displayed in Figure 20b. For instance, using $K = 6$, a source function with $\psi_- = 7.3$ and $B = 0.5$ fits the data just as well as a source function with $\psi_- = 4.3$ and $B = 1$. Holding $B = 1$ allows an estimate of $\psi_-$ for the study events. These $\psi_-$'s can be compared with large teleseismic short-period data sets to establish a realistic estimate of $t'_s$, and in this case, $t'_s = 0.9$ (as reported by Burdick et al. 1984). Adding the intercorrelation procedure (Lay et al., 1984b) allows source strengths of other events such as LONGSHOT to be estimated and a scaling law developed based on short-period signals (see Figure 21a.) Lay et al. (1984a) fixed $B$ at 1 for MILROW and adjusted the $B$'s of LONGSHOT and CANNIKIN to match the Rayleigh wave differentials (Figure 21b). A further modification is possible if we can establish the absolute long-period level.

Three types of data are available for this purpose, namely long-period $P$-waves, the phase $pS$ and the direct modeling of the Rayleigh waves. The long-period $P$-waves prove disappointing because the interactions of $pP$ with $t'$ reduces the sensitivity to $B$. Thus ratios (SPZ/LPZ) of short-period vertical $P$-wave amplitudes to long-period vertical Rayleigh wave amplitudes depend mostly on the values of $t'$ (see Figure 22). The average observed ratio SPZ/LPZ using 28 long-period records is 0.65, and we again obtain a $t'$, near 1.0. The phase $pS$ appears the most promising, since
Figure 20. A suite of source models for event CANNIKIN (top panel). The $\Psi_0$ determined from the first swing in the waveform is printed to the left of each synthetic. Bottom panel shows the trade-off of $\Psi_0$ and $B$ for CANNIKIN for a specific $K$. 
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Figure 21. Reduced displacement potentials. (a) based on short period signals. (b) from broadband data: fixing $B=1$ for MILROW, and adjusting the $B$'s of LONGSHOT and CANNIKIN to match Rayleigh wave differentials. (c) from broadband data: utilizing long-period $P$-waves, the phase $pS$, and Rayleigh waves. [Figure modified from Lay et al., 1984.]
Figure 22. Amplitude ratios of short period vertical (SPZ) to long period vertical (LPZ) for event CANNIKIN. The average observed ratio using 28 LPZ records is 0.65, indicated by the solid line.
these waveforms are not subjected to any strong interference such as the $P-pP$ waveforms. Some examples of the 21 observations available are given in Figure 23. However, one complication with this phase is the $S-P$ conversion at the Moho beneath the receiver. Note the small positive pulse preceding the negative direct $pS$ arrival. There can also be problems associated with later arrivals, the so-called $SV$-coupled $PL$ waves. Other complications can occur at the source region caused by tectonic release and possible spall interaction. These problems are discussed at length by Cohee and Lay (1988) in their study of $pS$ from some Novaya Zemlya events.

The synthetics displayed in Figure 23 were calculated assuming that the elastic conversion $P$ to $S$ is $-0.456$ for a ray parameter of $0.12$ sec/km. This is consistent with the value used in modeling the phase $pS$ in earthquake studies (Langston and Helmberger, 1975). Note that the actual reflection point occurs outside the region of strongest spall (a distance of roughly 1.5 km for CANNIKIN) because of the change in ray parameters ($0.07$ for $pP$ and $0.12$ for $sP$). The remaining difficulty is in estimating $t'_a$ (see Figure 24). If we assume that $t'_a = 4t'_w$, we obtain the expected value of $t'_a = 3.6$. Under this assumption, which is supported by many earthquake studies, it becomes possible to determine the appropriate combination of $B$ and $\psi_-$ to satisfy the $pS$ waveforms and absolute amplitude levels. The average amplitude of the CANNIKIN $pS$ phase from 21 observations is $2083$ m/s which implies that $B = 0.4$ and $\psi_- = 7.3 \times 10^{11}$ cm$^2$. This value of $\psi_-$ agrees remarkably well with that determined by Rayleigh wave modeling, as reported by Toksöz and Kehrer (1972) who obtained $\psi_- = 7.2 \times 10^{11}$ cm$^2$. Thus, we set the absolute level of CANNIKIN to be $7.3 \times 10^{11}$ cm$^3$ and adjust the other two events accordingly to obtain the RDP's given in Figure 21c. If we follow the basic scaling arguments of Mueller and Murphy (1971), namely that yield ($Y$) is proportional to effective cavity volume, we expect

$$\psi_- = c_1 Y / h^{0.27}$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

and

$$K = c_2 h^{0.42} / Y^{0.32}$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)
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Figure 23. Comparison of observed long period $pS$ waveforms and synthetics using different values of $t_0^*$ for event CANNIKIN. The source model and velocity structure are obtained from near field modeling.
Figure 24. Synthetic pS amplitudes for event CANNIKIN, where the first peak amplitude is plotted against \( t^* \) for different values of \( B \) and \( \Psi_\infty \).
The two scaling constants, $c_1$ and $c_2$, can then be estimated by regression assuming the yields of LONGSHOT, MILROW and CANNIKIN. The results are

$$c_1 = 12.3 \times 10^8$$
$$c_2 = 4.7$$

The parameter $B$ now depends on depth and is given by

$$\log B = -0.05 \times 1.3 \log h$$

These formulas prove quite effective in explaining the GASBUGGY-RULISON tests as discussed later.

**Scaling Relationships at NTS:** The data set at NTS is much larger than that at Amchitka but again consists mostly of a collection of strong motion and teleseismic seismograms. There also exists an abundance of free-field data at distances of less than a few kilometers. Most of this type of data is for small events whose yield is less than 15 kilotons. The few measurements that do exist for larger events are inconsistent in most situations (Murphy, 1991).

The strong motion records at distances beyond a few kilometers are much more complicated at NTS than at Amchitka, presumably because of the complex local geology (Barker et al., 1991). However, the initial motions of the type discussed earlier for CANNIKIN (Figure 20) can still be modeled using the structure derived in Barker et al. Figure 25a through 25e display complete seismograms for the best recorded events. The columns on the left are appropriate for the $B=1$ assumption used earlier in the extensive intercorrelation exercise (Lay et al., 1984). The columns on the right correspond to using a slightly different scaling law than Barker et al. and allowing for an adjustment in $B$ to fit the estimated long-period source strengths. The synthetics generated in Figure 25 were produced by Filon-AS, a frequency-wavenumber code. The crustal model is given in Table 1.
Figure 25 (a). Near-in observations (top bold traces) and predictions (bottom traces) for event BOXCAR. The station names and distances are printed on the left; amplitudes are printed on the right, and values of $K$, $\psi_0$ (PSI), and $B$ are printed above each column.
Figure 25 (b). Near-in observations (top bold traces) and predictions (bottom traces) for event MAST. The station names and distances are printed on the left; amplitudes are printed on the right, and values of \( K \), \( \Psi \) (PSI), and \( B \) are printed above each column.
Figure 25 (c). Near-in observations (top bold traces) and predictions (bottom traces) for event INLET. The station names and distances are printed on the left; amplitudes are printed on the right, and values of $K$, $\Psi$ (PSI), and $B$ are printed above each column.
Figure 25 (d). Near-in observations (top bold traces) and predictions (bottom traces) for event HALFBEAK. The station names and distances are printed on the left; amplitudes are printed on the right, and values of $K$, $\psi_-$ (PSI), and $B$ are printed above each column.
Figure 25 (e). Near-in observations (top bold traces) and predictions (bottom traces) for event SCOTCH. The station names and distances are printed on the left; amplitudes are printed on the right, and values of $K$, $\psi_\tau$ (PSI), and $B$ are printed above each column.
TABLE 1. Velocity Structure Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Layer</th>
<th>( \alpha ), km/s</th>
<th>( \beta ), km/s</th>
<th>( \rho ), g/cm(^3)</th>
<th>Thickness, km</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model from Hartzell et al. (1983)

The long-period \( \Psi \) estimates are less certain for NTS events for several reasons. First, the \( F \) factor or tectonic release is much higher than at Amchitka, making it more difficult to correct the surface waves as well as the long-period SV-waves for contamination. Secondly, the geologic structure is more complex in the source region, so that individual shots sample different source parameters (Murphy, 1989). Results from Rayleigh wave modeling by Stevens (1986) is given in Table 2 along with \( \Psi \) estimates from the intercorrelation technique (Lay et al., 1984a). Note that \( \Psi \) estimated from \( m_b \) is consistently smaller than \( \Psi \) estimated from \( M_b \). The ratio is about three to one but with considerable scatter. The depth effect on \( B \) is not particularly obvious in this data set. Note that the event CHESIRE is deeper than ESTUARY although its LP/SP ratio is smaller. This does not support the \( B \) vs. depth dependence discussed earlier in connection with Amchitka data. The Rayleigh wave strength given by Stevens (1986) is in general agreement with those given by Given and Mellman (1986) such that a factor of about three appears appropriate in the \( \Psi \) off-sets.
TABLE 2. Strength Estimates from Surface Waves and Body Waves

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Events</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>(\psi(M_S))</th>
<th>(\psi(m_b))</th>
<th>Depth (km)</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scotch</td>
<td>05/23/67</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stinger</td>
<td>03/22/68</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sled</td>
<td>08/29/68</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almendro</td>
<td>06/06/73</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tybo</td>
<td>05/14/75</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stilton</td>
<td>06/03/75</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mast</td>
<td>06/19/75</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheshire</td>
<td>02/14/76</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estuary</td>
<td>03/09/76</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool</td>
<td>03/17/76</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following the results of strong-motion modeling assuming \(B=1\) (Hartzell et al., 1983) we used the parameterizations given earlier in equations (1) and (2) obtaining

\[
c_1 = 20.1 \times 10^8
\]

\[
c_2 = 4
\]

where \(c_1\) has been increased by a factor of 3. These formulas apply when using \(B=1\). If we used the corner frequency scaling relative to Amchitka we obtain the synthetic comparisons given in Figure 26. These begin to produce too much short-period energy at the nearest stations and do not fit the acceleration data (Helmberger et al., 1991a). Thus, the corner frequency difference between the two sites appears real. We now have MILROW and BOXCAR with \(K\)'s of 9 and 7 and \(\psi\)'s of \(1.8 \times 10^{11}\)cm\(^3\) and \(3.6 \times 10^{11}\)cm\(^3\). The difference in \(\psi\) accounts for a \(6M_S=0.48\) which we essentially constructed.

**Off-Test Site Events:** The local and teleseismic data from various off-test site events have been extensively studied in attempts to explain the scatter from standard \(m_b;M_S;Y\) curves. For example, LRSM stations were established at FAULTLESS, RULISON, and GASBUGGY epicenters to measure relative attenuation to explain \(\delta m_b\)'s with respect to \(\delta Y\) differences. These results generally do not
Figure 26 (a). Near-in observations (top bold traces) and predictions (bottom traces) for event BOXCAR using Amchitka scaling. The station names and distances are printed on the left; amplitudes are printed on the right, and values of $K$, $\Psi$, (PSI), and $B$ are printed above each column.
Figure 26 (b). Near-in observations (top bold traces) and predictions (bottom traces) for event MAST using Amchitka scaling. The station names and distances are printed on the left; amplitudes are printed on the right, and values of $K$, $\Psi$ (PSI), and $B$ are printed above each column.
### Figure 26 (c).

Near-in observations (top bold traces) and predictions (bottom traces) for event INLET using Amchitka scaling. The station names and distances are printed on the left; amplitudes are printed on the right, and values of $K$, $\Psi_\infty$ (PSI), and $B$ are printed above each column.
Figure 26 (d). Near-in observations (top bold traces) and predictions (bottom traces) for event HALFBEAK using Amchitka scaling. The station names and distances are printed on the left; amplitudes are printed on the right, and values of $K$, $\Psi$ (PSI), and $B$ are printed above each column.
Figure 26 (e). Near-in observations (top bold traces) and predictions (bottom traces) for event SCOTCH using Amchitka scaling. The station names and distances are printed on the left; amplitudes are printed on the right, and values...
appear to explain the anomalies (Der et al., 1980). For example, the attenuation at the RULISON site is nearly the same as at GASBUGGY, and attenuation at FAULTLESS is the same as it is at NTS. Thus, anomalies in $m_b$ remain unexplained. On the other hand, $M_s$ values prove effective in estimating these yields as discussed by Yacoub (1983).

**A) RULISON and GASBUGGY, a Test of Scaling:** The two non-NTS nuclear blasts, RULISON and GASBUGGY, provide a particularly useful test case for determining the transportability of different methods of estimating yields (see Table 3). These two nuclear events were detonated 304 km apart in nearby sedimentary basins in New Mexico and Colorado. Although the announced yield of RULISON was 40 kt and that of GASBUGGY was 29 kt, GASBUGGY has a larger $m_b$. The most thorough analysis of this discrepancy was presented by Murphy and Archambeau (1986). Although the amplitude differences between the two events are of the order that might be expected from a difference in $t_e$ of 0.4 sec between the two events, their analysis of the $P$-wave displacement spectra of the two events indicated that the effective $t_e$ for the two events are essentially the same, in agreement with Der's (1980) results. Murphy and Archambeau present evidence that the RULISON-GASBUGGY anomaly is principally caused by tectonic release associated with RULISON. They suggest that this release of tectonic energy was oriented in such a fashion as to destructively interfere with, and reduce the amplitudes of, the teleseismic short-period $P$-waves for RULISON. The magnitude of their proposed release is such that the amplitude of the tectonic $P$-waves is roughly one half of the amplitude of the explosion $P$-waves.

**TABLE 3. Explosion Source Parameters**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Yield (kt)</th>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GASBUGGY</td>
<td>36.68° N. 107.21° W.</td>
<td>10/12/1967</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RULISON</td>
<td>39.41° N. 107.95° W.</td>
<td>10/09/1969</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2573</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although the tectonic release hypothesis cannot be ruled out, the amount of tectonic release required to produce this much interference is difficult to support from the results presented in Burdick et al. (1991a). Another interpretation is that this reduction in RULISON's amplitude is caused by a decrease in the $B$ factor as suggested by the above scaling relations for Amchitka.

Using the Amchitka scaling relations, the predicted values for GASBUGGY ($h=1.29$ km, $Y=29$ kt) are $B=0.64$, $K=31$, and $\Psi_- = 4.5 \times 10^9$ cm$^3$ or $M_0=2.6 \times 10^{22}$ dyne-cm. For RULISON ($h=2.57$ km, $Y=40$ kt), the predicted values are $B=0.27$, $K=37$, and $\Psi_- = 5.9 \times 10^9$ cm$^3$ or $M_0=3.7 \times 10^{22}$ dyne-cm (Figure 27). Synthetic seismograms calculated using these source functions parameters and the crustal structures given by Murphy and Archambeau predict that the $m_b$ for GASBUGGY is 0.23 units higher than that for RULISON. This difference is primarily caused by the small $B$ value for RULISON.

Although the Amchitka scaling laws do a good job at predicting the $m_b$ values of GASBUGGY and RULISON an examination of the recorded RDP's of GASBUGGY (Figure 28) shows that the prediction is not perfect. Only one of the RDP's shows a significant overshoot. The mean overshoot is 15%, corresponding to a $B$ of 0.32. A K value approximately equal to 27 with a $\Psi_- = 6.4 \times 10^9$ cm$^3$, were needed to model the rise time (see the bottom trace). These observations of the direct RDP are rather unique in that gas-wells were available for subsurface observations (Perret, 1982). They were all taken at a slant range of about 0.5 km, well outside the nonlinear zone. The average RDP at the bottom of Figure 28 shows a higher $\Psi_-$ and a lower overshoot than predicted by any scaling laws.

The moments obtained from modeling the surface waves (Burdick et al., 1991a) are $2.0 \times 10^{22}$ and $2.1 \times 10^{22}$ dyne-cm, which are somewhat low compared to both the observed RDP and predicted RDP. These discrepancies are probably within modeling errors, but the evidence for undershoot in this experiment is strong.
Figure 27. Reduced displacement potentials for PNE's GASBUGGY ($B=0.64$, $K=31$, $\Psi = 4.5 \times 10^9$) and RULISON ($B=0.27$, $K=37$, $\Psi = 5.9 \times 10^9$).
Figure 28. Upper four traces display the observed RDP's obtained from the GASBUGGY explosion, after Perret (1982). Bottom trace displays a scaled RDP.
B) FAULTLESS and ALMENDRO. Further Test of Scaling: Since the $P$-waveforms from Pahute Mesa events have been studied at great length by Burdick and his associates it is natural to compare data from the FAULTLESS event with a Pahute Mesa event (ALMENDRO) having comparable yield (see Figure 29). Both blasts were detonated in similar environments. ALMENDRO ($m_b=6.41$) was located roughly 150 km to the north. The pairs of seismograms are from the same teleseismic WWSSN stations. It appears that the FAULTLESS seismograms are anomalously long period for such a small event. This suggests a higher $t_a$ but several detailed attenuation experiments indicate comparable values of $t_a$ at these two sites. NTS $P$-waveforms for the large events such as BOXCAR are similar to FAULTLESS and intercorrelation of FAULTLESS using BOXCAR as a master event produce the same yields (Lay et al., 1983). In short, the $P$-waveforms from FAULTLESS fall nicely into the Pahute Mesa population, but are too strong. Allowing the $B$ to increase by roughly a factor of two for FAULTLESS can explain this $\delta m_b$ anomaly as discussed in Burdick et al. (1991a). Since the $M_S$'s for these events are roughly the same, we consider this a reasonable explanation.

Discussion: In previous sections we have reviewed the data and scaling law applications for various U.S. shots. In this section we discuss the yield equations put forward by other researchers for sites outside US and how we think these should be altered based on this study. Because of strong evidence for overshoot variations from site to site we believe that magnitudes based upon long-period excitation are the most reliable. Thus, we begin with yield estimation based on $M_S$. From Sykes and Wiggins (1986) we obtain the Novaya Zemlya scaling relation

$$M_S = 0.971 \log_{10} Y + 2.16$$

This equation, in fact, matches the Amchitka data better than does the Amchitka scaling relation presented earlier,

$$M_S = \log_{10} Y + 2.0$$
Figure 29. A comparison of seismograms of observed WWSSN P-waveforms for the two explosions ALMENDRO (A) and FAULTLESS (F) as a function of azimuth (same station). The numbers indicate the ratios of peak amplitudes (FAULTLESS/ALMENDRO).
when the most accurate yield values are inserted. This does not greatly change the modeling exercise discussed earlier except to make the dependence of $B$ upon depth even stronger. The formula by Sykes and Cifuentes (1984) for Eastern Kazakh is nearly the same as above, namely,

$$M_x = 0.95 \log_{10} Y + 2.16$$

The results for NTS show an obvious off-set from Amchitka and other sites as discussed earlier. If we compare the 10 largest events fired at Shagan River versus the 10 largest events fired at NTS after the 1976 150 kt threshold (as suggested by Figure 16 of Stevens, 1986), we obtain

$$\bar{M}_x(NTS) - \bar{M}_x(ShaganRiver) = 0.63$$

with an average $M_0$ of $7.58 \times 10^{22}$ dyne-cm at Shagan River vs. an average $M_0$ of $1.74 \times 10^{23}$ dyne-cm at NTS. Our formula predicts a $\bar{M}_x$ for NTS which is 0.39 units higher than that for Amchitka. This suggests that the $\psi$ scaling laws for Amchitka are applicable to Soviet tests (as assumed by Sykes and his colleagues). Thus, NTS appears to have a unique scaling law characterized by undershoot compared to any other site. If we suppose that most of the Novaya Zemlya tunnel events are fired at similar depths, we conclude that the smallest events are over-buried while the larger events are under-buried. Thus, at Novaya Zemlya we would expect small $B$'s for small events and large $B$'s for large events, or $m_b$ increasing with increasing yield more rapidly than at Amchitka (see Figure 30). For example, suppose we compare the larger events at Amchitka (where the data is the most complete) with comparable events at Novaya Zemlya. For the largest Novaya Zemlya event (October 27, 1973), the Sykes formula predicts a yield of 2840 kt for the observed $M_S$ of 5.5. The $\psi$ obtained for this event by Cohee and Lay (1988) is $3.8 \times 10^{11}$ cm$^3$ (assuming the SL.8 attenuation model proposed by Anderson and Hart, 1978). This estimate was made using a $t_o$ of 4.8, which is probably high. The trade-off between $\psi$ and $t_o$ was shown earlier in Figure 24. Reducing $t_o$ to 0.5 and $t'_o$ to 2.0 suggests a $\psi$ near $2 \times 10^{11}$ cm$^3$, a value midway between that of MILROW and CANNIKIN. The $m_b$ for the Novaya Zemlya event is 6.9 or that of CANNIKIN.
Figure 30. (Top panel) Effect of varying $t^*$ on events LONGSHOT, MILROW, and CANNIKIN while holding source function and moment constant. The solid line represents actual $m_b$ vs. $M_S$ values. (Bottom panel) Effect of varying $B$ for same events while holding $t^*$ and moment constant. The crosses represent actual $m_b$ vs. $M_S$ values.
However, allowing $B$ to grow for this large Novaya Zemlya event easily reduces its $\psi$ to a value near that of MILROW. In short, it is very difficult to use the $m_b$'s to directly estimate yields while dealing with these trade-offs of $t^*$ and $B$.

The $m_b$ measurement thus is shown to have several problems in estimating the yield of bombs in geological regimes which do not have numerous test shots available. These include unknown factors of corner frequency, overshoot, tectonic release, and $t^*$. Using a regional $M_S$ measurement, when possible, should serve to minimize the problems caused by these factors. Such factors as explosion coupling will still remain a problem.

In most instances, however, Soviet $m_b$'s will still have to be used. Perhaps the simplest use of the Soviet $m_b$'s is to directly relate them to Soviet $M_S$ vs. yield relations. By taking

$$m_b = 1.05M_S + 1.63$$

and substituting

$$M_S = 0.97\log_{10}Y + 2.16$$

we obtain

$$m_b = 1.021\log_{10}Y + 3.9.$$ 

Thus for events that have high $F$-factors we can still estimate the yields from $m_b$. This equation estimates the $m_b$ of a 150 kt event at Shagan River to be 6.1 as observed during the recent PVE. However, instead of adjusting the U.S. curve by applying the $\delta m_b$ bias correction, we adopt the scaling relation from that of Amchitka and explain the difference in $m_b$ by overshoot and attenuation.
Q STUDIES PART I - EFFECT OF Q ON THE REGIONAL Pn and Sn COMPOSITION RECORDED IN U.S. AND U.S.S.R

Introduction: With the installation of the broad-band, high dynamic range IRIS instruments, it has become possible to compare the regional waveforms of earthquakes and explosions at magnitudes 3 to 6. The dynamic range feature of these systems allows the comparison of the relatively weak body waves (PnI) with the stronger surface waves. The broad-band feature allows the examination of the frequency content of particular phases (Pn and Sn) to address the Q-issue. Computational methodologies have advanced in recent time which together with the development of recent fast computational facilities has made it feasible to investigate the response of a laterally varying crustal medium within a reasonable time frame. Among other methods, the generalized ray theory is a most widely used method for analysis of the composition of seismic phases that the source process and the propagation effect together make up at a receiving station. While this method is applied to a flat-layered crustal structure in most studies, the method has recently been extended to include range-dependent structure (Helmberger, personal communication). It is a computationally fast technique, but requires many generalized rays to be tracked between the source and the receiver for a regional waveguide. As the crustal medium becomes complicated, the method can quickly become quite cumbersome with the process of just tracking the rays. The anelasticity of the waveguide is applied to resulting response of many generalized rays in terms of $t^*$ which is an average estimate of seismic attenuation. In actuality, seismic waves attenuate in different amounts depending on the material property and should be treated as an intrinsic behavior of the medium. Thus, Q (quality factor) should be defined for each crustal layer for both compressional and shear waves.

At high frequencies the effects of scattering in the crust become so intense that only statistical properties of waveforms are meaningful. The receiver related crustal structure can be complex and may cause additional complexity beyond that already caused by the triplications of seismic waves due to the gradual velocity increase of the crust-mantle transition zone. The presence of a
gradient structure near the receiver changes the timing of surface reflected phases and their reflection coefficients. Consequently, the waveforms become complex and generalized ray theory can be used to identify the significant arrivals within the composition of short-period signals (Saikia and Burdick, 1991). The most suitable computational method to apply for investigating the effect of a crustal waveguide of this nature is the method of frequency-wavenumber integration/reflectivity. It allows evaluation of full medium response where the intrinsic aspects of the attenuation of the medium can be specified and effects on the Pn and Sn composition can be investigated.

In a recent study, Saikia and Burdick (1991) showed that short-period Pnl waves (period as short as 2 s) are stable and can be modeled. They studied many observations from Nevada Test Site (NTS) explosions recorded at regional distances of 200 to 420 km and modeled the Pnl waveforms using a deterministic crustal waveguide. The sources of these waveforms were shallow. Also, the sources were predominantly isotropic, and the portion of Pnl waves which was included in the Pn and Pg waves had a duration of about 30 s and was dominated by compressional waves. To understand the observed data, they used the frequency-wavenumber algorithm to compute the explosion generated Pnl waves for several canonical crustal models and selected a crustal model based on the agreement between the data and the synthetic seismograms. The method was then utilized to understand the composition of the Pg wave group which was constituted of phases like PmP, pPmP, 2PmP, PmS, pPmS, PmPmP, PmSPmP etc for realistic models. Pg is a wave group whose frequency content is widely used to discriminate events. In this study, we have taken a similar strategy to investigate the broadband composition of Pnl and Snl seismograms recorded in the North American continent at regional distance from double-couple sources and of the P and S waveforms that are recorded within the Soviet Union. We shall mainly focus on identifying the rays important to model the regional waves within the S wave window and investigate how the intrinsic Q model affects the waveform composition.
**Data:** For the U.S. study, we used a set of three-component broadband seismograms recorded at Harvard (HRV) station at a distance of 640 km from the Saguenay earthquake of November 25, 1988 (Figure 31a). These seismograms were recorded on a Streckeisen seismometer. We selected these seismograms because many features recorded on the seismograms were successfully modeled by Zhao and Helmberger (1991). Beginning with their crustal model, we have directed our study towards the modeling the high-frequency details observed in the PnI waves and the composition of waves identified as S, and sSn by Zhao and Helmberger (1991) using a multiple source model. A similar study was directed towards the modeling of the broadband seismograms recorded within the Soviet Union. We selected a set of three-component seismograms recorded at GARM from an earthquake which originated at a distance of 200 km at an azimuth of 290° on May 4, 1989 (38.73°N and 78.50°W, Figure 31b). Unlike for North American earthquakes, the waveforms of very few Soviet Union earthquakes have been modeled. Thus, it is necessary to develop a starting crustal model even to obtain a first-order agreement between data and synthetic.

**Modeling of HRV Seismograms from the Saguenay Earthquake:** Figure 32 shows the broadband displacements recorded at Harvard station. To investigate the influence of crustal structure on the various significant phases of the PnI window, we have started with the crustal model shown in Figure 33 by dotted lines. This model extends from the surface to a half space at a depth of 55 km. The major velocity discontinuity is at a depth of 35 km where the P velocity jumps from 6.71 km/s to 8.1 km/s and the S velocity jumps from 3.82 km/s to 4.7 km/s. Zhao and Helmberger (1991) used a reflectivity code (Mallick and Frazer, 1988) to compute the medium response and used an elastic crustal structure to model the data. They used a Q9 (shear-wave quality factor) of 6200 and stated that a lower value of Q9 is not required to match the recorded wave form, although the conventional wisdom is that for eastern North America Q9 is of the order of 300 (Hwang and Mitchell, 1987). Based on this published information, we started to look for certain phases within the PnI regime for which the agreement between the data and synthetic can be improved and in the process to learn more about the regional waveguide.
Figure 31. Geographical location of (a) HRV (Harvard0 station (solid triangle) and November 25, 1988 Saguenay earthquake (solid star) and (b) GAR (Garm) station (solid triangle) and May 4, 1989 USSR earthquake (solid star).
Broadband Displacement recorded at Harvard Station from 1988-11-25, Saguenay Earthquake

Figure 32. Broadband three-component displacement seismograms as recorded by Harvard station from the 1988, November 25 Saguenay earthquake. The original seismograms were integrated.
Figure 33. Regional crustal model developed by modeling the broad-band seismograms recorded at Harvard station from the November 25, 1988 Saguenay earthquake. The final model is shown by the solid lines. The model shown by the dotted lines is the initial crustal model developed by Zhao and Helmberger, 1990.
The phases marked as $S_n$ and $sS_n$ show the greatest misfit between the data and the synthetics computed by Zhao and Helmberger (1991) (see their Figure 16). The synthetic seismograms are definitely of lower frequency. So our initial attempt was to understand what part of the crustal waveguide would be most critical in development of these waveforms. In the present calculation, we used the frequency-wavenumber integration method and set the nyquist frequency at 10 Hz. We computed theoretical seismograms for eight fundamental faults and used a focal mechanism with a dip $65^\circ$, a rake of $78^\circ$ and a strike of $323^\circ$ to predict the vertical, radial and tangential component seismograms. These synthetics were used to compute both the point and multiple source seismograms and the corresponding vertical component seismograms are shown in Figure 34. The source model contained three sub-sources, with seismic moments of $1.55\times10^{24}$, $1.45\times10^{24}$ and $1.95\times10^{24}$ dyne-cm respectively (after Zhao and Helmberger, 1991). The second source was delayed by 0.65 s and the third source by 1.45 s from the first source to account for the propagation of the rupture front. The first source was represented with a source time function defined by a trapezoid of 0.4s rise time, 0.05s of follow-on time and 0.25s of healing time. Similarly, the second and third sources were convolved with trapezoids of (0.2s, 0.15s, 0.15s) and (0.1s, 0.3s, 0.2s), respectively. We also show the synthetic seismograms generated by Zhao and Helmberger (1991) in Figure 35 using a nyquist frequency of 4 Hz so that a direct comparison can be made with those shown in Figure 34. The frequency content in the $P_{nl}$ waves of these seismograms is not as rich as those $P_{nl}$ waves shown in Figure 34 where the high frequencies are the result of derived source complexity.

In Figure 36, we compare the vertical and radial component showing just the $P_{nl}$ portion of the seismograms computed using the parameters of multiple sources. The high-frequency signals are adequately predicted with respect to those observed on the recorded data. The seismograms computed using the response up to 4 Hz were essentially identical to these seismograms.
Figure 34. Comparison Between two sets of displacement seismograms synthesized using point and multiple sources. (a) Point-source displacements - the upper seismogram is computed using the model response of Zhao and Helmberger (1991) and the bottom seismogram is computed using the model response of the present crustal model, and (b) multiple-source displacements for the two crustal models.
Figure 35. Comparison between data and synthetic displacements with a nyquist of 4 Hz. The seismograms for 625 km was computed using a different velocity crustal model (Figure taken from Zhao and Helmberger, 1991).
Figure 36. Comparison between data and synthetic displacements with a model response up to a nyquist of 10 Hz. Note the development of high frequencies and agreement between phases marked by the arrows.
**Ray Analysis of Pal Seismograms:** In this section, we discuss our investigation of the constituent phases of the recorded $P_n$ seismogram at Harvard station. The basic idea is to investigate the interaction of individual ray groups in creating the total seismogram. We computed generalized ray seismograms using the source process of the Saguenay earthquake for several groups of generalized rays. In Figure 37, we display vertical-component seismograms of these ray groups. The top six seismograms are normalized to their maximum amplitude. All the PmP and SmS rays were allowed to reflect from each interface beneath the crust-mantle boundary including the reflection from the Moho discontinuity. The total response of these PmP and SmS rays is plotted in the first seismogram. The geometric arrivals are indicated by PmP and SmS respectively. The $S_n$ arrival is small and is preceded by a refracted phase SP. This refracted phase had developed due to a critical incidence of an S wave on an interface permitting the converted P phase to travel along the interface. The seismogram in the second row is for the sPmP, a ray which has departed from the source as a S wave and then converted to P mode at the free surface. The amplitude of this ray is small. The next seismogram is for sSmS. Both the geometric and head waves are strong for this ray group and contribute significantly to the total seismogram. The next two seismograms are for the SmSSmS and sSmSSmS ray groups. Both the ray groups have significant contributions. The sixth seismogram is for a ray group identified as SmS'SmS. The rays included in this group leave the source downward and reflect from each interface. The reflections are turned back into the lower crust again at the Moho discontinuity before they are reflected back to the receiver. The contributions from these rays do offer a significant contribution to the evolution of the $S_n$ wave group. The seismogram "Total" is the result of direct sum of the upper six seismograms. Having obtained a good agreement between the data and the synthetics, we plotted the multiple-source frequency wavenumber seismogram computed using the frequency-wavenumber method beneath the total response for a direct comparison. This comparison produced good agreement among the dominant features within the so called "$S_n$ waves."
Generalized Ray Interpretation of PnI Waves at Regional Distance - R=640.0 Km (Saguenay Epicenter to HARVARD)

Figure 37. Understanding the waveform recorded at Harvard station using the ray decomposition technique. The top six seismograms are for the individual ray groups. The seismogram labelled "Total" is the total response of all the responses of upper six seismograms and the comparison with the F-K seismograms shown below suggests a good agreement between the two seismograms.
Thus, we have extended our previous study (Saikia and Burdick, 1991) on the deciphering of the ray composition of Pg waves from explosion sources to earthquake sources. As in the above study, we found that the waveforms within the Sn group can be studied in time domain in terms of a basic few rays, namely the SmS, sSmS, SmSSmS, sSmSSmS and SmS'SmS rays. Since these phases leave the source as S waves, they are not excited by the explosion source. Therefore, the only phases that may arrive within the $S_n$ widow from a pure isotropic source are the P waves that are converted to S waves.

Effect of Intrinsic Q on Pn and Sn: It is expected that anelasticity will influence the frequency content of the Pn and Sn waves. In this study, we wish to investigate the effects on regional Pn and Sn composition related to intrinsic Q, especially the changes relative to the seismograms of an elastic medium. Our objective is to determine the group of waves that is most sensitive to the variation in Q. We assume that Q varies significantly within the upper crustal medium. An initial anelastic calculation was performed using a $Q_0$ of 250 in the upper 35 km of the crust. $Q_a$ was assumed to be twice of $Q_p$. Below 35 km, the entire medium was treated as elastic. In an another Q model, $Q_a$ was lowered substantially from 250 to 50 within the upper 5 km of the crust. Figure 38 shows a comparison of the recorded broadband vertical seismograms at Harvard station (top seismogram) with three synthetic seismograms resulting from the elastic and two anelastic propagation media. The second seismogram is multiple-source seismogram computed using the elastic model. While the frequency content of the signals marked by arrows compare well with the data, the surface waves are of much higher frequency. The third seismogram is synthesized using the anelastic model of $Q_p$ equal to 250 throughout the 35 km thick crust. The fourth seismogram is synthesized with a $Q_a$ of 50 as discussed. The bottom two seismograms are remarkably similar. The frequency content of the surface waves or other multiple bounces following the third arrow are in better agreement with the data although the fundamental-mode Rayleigh wave appears longer in period.
In Figure 38, we show only the first 75s of the seismograms plotted in the previous figure. Clearly the similarities between data and synthetics are striking, suggesting that the waveshape of the Pn waves is least affected by the variation in Q model. Figure 39 shows a comparison of both Pn and Sn wave groups separately as a function of different Q models. The seismograms shown in the two boxes are the windowed Pn and Sn waves shown in the upper two seismograms. Included in the Pn panel are the classical/turning ray Pn and PmP wave, and in the Sn panel are the classical/turning ray Sn, surface refracted SP, sSn and SmSSn waves. As seen in the previous figure, the P waveforms are strikingly similar but the waveforms drawn in the Sn box, especially the sSn and SmSSn phases, show a large dependence on the Q model.

This study pertains to the Saguenay earthquake which is a deep event, depth 27 km. We would expect explosions to be shallow. But the Pn generated from such shallow sources spends only a slightly longer path in the low Q materials. Thus it can be assumed that the initial Pn waves from the two sources will be affected in an identical manner by anelasticity. However, the phases like sSmS and SmSSmS are more dramatically affected by the Q model. Therefore, any spectral ratios of Pn to SP+sSn; pPn to SP+Sn etc., may provide a reasonable measure of Q.

Modeling of GARM Seismograms from May 4, 1989 USSR Earthquake: In this study we have used a set of three-component seismograms recorded at the Garm station from an earthquake of May 4, 1989 (latitude: 39.436°N and longitude: 75.35°E, h=35 km, ISC). The station is located at a distance of 200 km from the source. Figure 40 shows the recorded displacements processed from the broadband velocity seismograms. A high-pass filter was applied to remove the long-period effects. The crustal structure encountered by the wavefield along its propagation path is complex which is reflected in the waveform. To begin to understand the waveforms, it was necessary to develop a crustal structure.

Our strategy for developing the crustal model was to begin with the tangential component seismogram because of the simplicity of the observed displacement. This component contains only three distinct individual arrivals as marked by the arrows. We used generalized ray theory to
Effect of Crustal $Q$ on the Whole Regional Waveform at HARVARD STATION - $R=640$ KM

Sensitivity of first 75 seconds of Pn waves to various $Q$ models

Figure 38. Comparison between broad-band vertical component data at Harvard station and corresponding synthetic seismograms computed for different $Q$-models including the elastic model. Also shown is the first 75 seconds of each seismogram for each $Q$ model.
Figure 39. Comparison between data broad-band vertical component Pn and Sn data and corresponding synthetic seismograms computed for different Q-models including the elastic model. The effect of Q on the Sn waves is more pronounced compared to the effect observed on the Sn waves.
Figure 40. Broadband three-component displacement seismograms as recorded by Garm station from the USSR earthquake of May 4, 1989. The original seismograms were integrated.
synthesize this component for various crustal models and several source depths. The best prediction was obtained for a source depth of 25 km for the preliminary crustal model shown in Figure 41. We used the following focal mechanism: dip=75°, slip=-135° and a strike=32°. The structure contains two major discontinuities representing the Conrad and the Moho. We succeeded in modeling the tangential displacement using only three arrivals: the direct SH and two reflections from the discontinuities. The frequency-wavenumber seismograms were computed with these parameters and were compared with the recorded data. Figure 42 shows the comparison between the data and the synthetic seismograms for the vertical and tangential components. We are successful in producing a good agreement between the data and the synthetic for the tangential motion. We mark the individual arrivals in the synthetic and show their correspondence with the data by the thin arrows. The vertical component show agreement in the arrivals of Pn, PmP, ScS and SmS phases. The signal bracketed within the window of the vertical-component synthetic seismogram has a similar character in the frequency content to the signal bracketed within the data window. Figure 43 shows a generalized ray seismogram using the three rays. The vertical synthetic seismogram has a strong SmS which is smeared out in the data due to the interaction with the physically more complicated crust in the region. The vertical component of the recorded seismogram is also dominated by long-period Pn signals shown by the solid window. These waves are also observed in the synthetic seismogram but arriving at Garm with a fast velocity. We also investigated the effect of a possible linear velocity gradient near the free surface to determine if such a velocity distribution would account for the mismatch between the data and the synthetics within bracketed the window shown in Figure 42. We discretized the top ten kilometers of the crust into ten layers of equal thickness and allowed a P-wave velocity increase from 4.5 km/sec to 5.5 km/sec from the surface. The S-wave velocity within each layer had a ratio of 1.73 to the P-wave velocity. This seemed to be a particularly reasonable explanation for the small complex phases between the major arrivals. However, the synthetic seismograms computed using this surface gradient did not improve the fit to a significant degree.
Figure 41. Regional velocity used for modeling GARM seismogram.
Preliminary Modeling of Broadband Displacement Recorded at GARM station, R=200 Km

Figure 42. Comparison is shown between the data and the synthetic seismogram for the vertical and tangential components. The signal marked by arrow 1 is a phase reflected from the Conrad and by arrow 2 is form the Moho discontinuity. The phase marked by arrow 3 on the tangential component is the direct arrival. The signal within the window shows a possible correlation between the data and synthetics.
Figure 43. A vertical component seismogram computed using direct $P$ and $S$, $PcP$ $ScS$, and $PmP$ and $SmS$ phases. These arrivals can distinctly be observed on the recorded seismograms.
**Effect of Intrinsic Q on S:** The objective of this study is to determine a level of agreement in the frequency content between the recorded and the predicted SH waves. Similar to the study of Harvard seismogram, we tried two Q models and the agreement between the data and the synthetic is shown in Figure 44. The elastic model predicts a higher frequency content for both the direct and conrad reflected SH waves (marked by the arrows). It appears Q lying in between 100 and 250 would predict the frequency content of these two phases in better agreement with the data. The Q for the Harvard seismogram was close to 250. Thus, Q is smaller along this path in Garm. In Figure 45, we show four vertical component seismograms recorded at the Garm station from four separate earthquakes of magnitude ranging from 4.7 to 5.0. Two of the seismograms are recorded at an azimuth of about 355°. These seismograms have signals with much higher frequency than those shown in the other two seismograms recorded at an azimuth of about 313°. Thus, Q around Garm station is perhaps more complicated. We expect to establish this in our next phase of waveform modeling.

**Comparison of Regional PnI Waves from the US and USSR Crustal Models:** In this section, we continue to investigate the regional waveforms that are likely to be predicted by the crustal models developed for North America and Soviet Union. Since the record at Harvard station was so successfully modelled and since it was at a range of 640 km, we examined the response of the USSR crust model at this range. In fact, seismograms at such distances are just becoming available from the Soviet Union. Figure 46 shows the comparison between the synthetic seismograms computed for the samples of the USSR and US crustal models for both the vertical and radial components assuming the same focal mechanism at the same azimuth. The seismograms were computed at the respective depths of the earthquakes and the two depths are similar. We also used the same source function. The GARM crustal model predicts a stronger PmP relative to the Pn. The S\textsubscript{n}/SP and sS\textsubscript{n} arrivals predicted in the seismograms by the US crustal model (marked by the arrows) seem to exhibit a correspondence to the long-period signals predicted in the response of the USSR crustal model. The difference in the amplitude ratios is caused by the differences.
Figure 44. Comparison between broad-band vertical component data at GARM station and corresponding synthetic seismograms computed for different Q-models including the elastic model. Also shown is the first 75 seconds of each seismogram for each Q model.
Figure 45. Broad-band seismograms recorded at GARM station from several azimuths where the variation of frequency content observed on these seismograms is a clear effect of crustal Q along the propagation paths.
Comparison of Displacement Seismograms at 640 Km for the U.S. and USSR Crustal Models

Figure 46. Comparison between the synthetic seismograms computed at 640 km for the USSR crustal model and the US crustal model. Both vertical and radial components are shown.
in the near-surface velocities of the two crustal models. For the North American crustal model, the crustal velocities have a gradient near the surface. The rays arrive at the receiver more steeply compared to the rays for the USSR crustal model, thus partitioning the energy in a significantly different ratio to the vertical and radial component.

We further investigated the composition of the $P_{nl}$ and $S_{nl}$ waves predicted by the USSR crustal model at 640 km in terms of generalized rays. We found that the S-wave reflections from the Moho and Conrad discontinuities are strong as shown in the top two seismograms of Figure 47. The Conrad reflection, $ScS$, arrives immediately following the Moho reflection $SmS$. The phase shown by an arrow on the $SmS$ seismogram is arriving at the arrival time of $Sn$ phase, but its waveshape is more complicated than is expected from a classical $Sn$ phase. Among the other phases that contribute most significantly to the total $P_{nl}$ seismogram within the S window are the $sSmS$, $SmSSmS$ and $ScSScS$ phases. The bottom two seismograms plotted in Figure 40 allow us to compare the agreement between the generalized ray (Total) and frequency wavenumber (F-K) seismograms. The agreement is poor following the $PmP$ arrival. A strong long-period signal does propagate to the receiver in the frequency wavenumber seismogram. This must be a total effect of many generalized rays. This effect was also observed on the recorded seismogram at Garm station even at a distance of 200 km from the source.

Conclusions: Based on these investigations, it seems feasible to develop time-domain discriminants at different nuclear test sites which rely on the stable features that are observed in the recorded waveforms. The most stable phases are observed in the explosion generated $P_{nl}$ waveforms for periods as short as 2 s (Burdick et al., 1991c; Saikia and Burdick, 1991). In this study, we have extended our analysis approach to regional broadband seismograms from earthquake sources. The short-period $P_{nl}$ waves have a functional dependence on the crustal waveguide. They can be deterministically modeled using average flat-layered crustal structures and using some selected generalized rays. By modeling the broadband displacement at Harvard station, we found that the structure across the crust-mantle transition zone and within the mantle can profoundly affect the
Generalized Ray Interpretation of PnI Waves at Regional Distance - R=640.0 Km - SOVIET UNION CRUSTAL MODEL

Figure 47. Understanding the waveform computed at 640 km from the USSR crustal model using the ray decomposition technique. The top six seismograms are for the individual ray groups.
frequency content of the phases like $S_n$ and $sS_n$. The source multiplicity of an earthquake can also create added complexity in the frequency content of these phases. We found that the $P_{nl}$ seismograms near the $S$-wave arrival can adequately be modeled using the ray responses of the following phases: $SmS$, $sSmS$, $SmSSmS$, $sSmSSmS$ and $SmS'SmS$.

For the Soviet Union, the most important requirement for understanding recorded seismograms is the crustal model. The structure within the Soviet Union is heterogeneous and the development of reliable crustal models is on-going (Gurrola and Minster, 1991). In this study, we have developed a crustal structure by modeling the recorded seismograms at Garm station from an earthquake at a distance of 200 km (Az=292°) which consisted of Conrad and Moho discontinuities. In addition, a slight gradient is allowed for the upper-mantle structure. The ray analysis indicated that the most important generalized rays for the composition of the $s_{nl}$ waves are the following phases: $SmS$, $ScS$, $sSmS$, $sScS$, $SmSSmS$ and $sSmSSmS$.

We found that the phases with longitudinal propagation mode is less affected by varying attenuation structure. The phases like $sSmS$, $SmSSmS$ which travel mostly with shear-mode of propagation are, however, significantly affected. Therefore, the spectra of the shear-wave phases will be deleted in high-frequency and the spectra ratio of $PmP$ and $PmPPmP$ phases to $sSmS$, $SmSSmS$ phases may provide a better event discrimination. For the problems related to the estimation of yield of a nuclear explosion, the dependence of the waveform amplitude on the $Q$ models can be crucial. It can, however, be seen in Figure 38 that the initial $Pnl$ waveform (say, first 20s after the $Pn$ onset) is less sensitive compared to the $Snl$ waveforms to the chosen variation in $Q$ models. Thus, it may appear that the analysis based on the early part of the regional $Pnl$ may be a better source for estimating yield of nuclear explosions. The explosions are expected to be shallow. If they are buried within the low $Q$ material, it is likely that the effect may be severe. Further investigations are needed to find these effects.
O STUDIES PART II - PRELIMINARY RESULTS FROM BROADBAND MODELING OF LONG RANGE REGIONAL SEISMOGRAMS

Introduction: Recent studies in the United States suggest that a great deal of information about structure and attenuation be obtained from broadband modeling of regional phases as demonstrated in the previous section (Saikia and Burdick, 1992). In this pilot effort, we have performed some basic calculations to test the usefulness of present earth models in predicting the observations. Figure 48 displays a map of Asia and digital stations recording two events from the Hindu-Kush region. Since many events of different focal mechanisms occur in this region at various depths, it becomes an ideal source region. Two events have been studied in detail as reported by Zhao and Helmburger (1991, see Figure 49). Broadband seismograms at several upper mantle distances are modeled in these studies using an earth model appropriate for the Tibet region, see Figure 50. The three stations, namely KIV, OBN and ARU, lie towards the northwest of this source region and the earth structure to these stations appears to be the most homogenous. In Figure 51 through 52, we show broadband recordings of two events of July 24, 1989 (3h 27m 48.77s) and February 5, 1990 (5h 16m 45.0s) at these sites. Both the events have simple seismograms with similar looking S at ARU. The P-waves are the most dissimilar, having different polarities and different strengths for pP and sP depth phases. Both events produced motions that rotate well into (P-SV) and (SH). The same is true for the other stations although the noise level at OBN is particularly strong. The P-waves are nearly nodal for the 1990 events at these stations.

From the previous studies of shield regions in North America, we would expect the paths to ARU, OBN and KIV to be similar to the paths described by SNA model for S waves (Grand and Helmburger, 1985) and by S25 model for P (LeFevre and Helmburger, 1989), see Figure 50. However, we have a problem in the source region where the crustal thickness is much greater than in SNA, roughly 60 km vs. 35 km. Thus, the broadband synthetics predicted by these models (SNA & S25) show an obvious problem in that sP and sS occur too early, see Figures 51 and 52. Note that observed sS is especially late on the 1990 KIV record. Since this event is at a depth of 102
Figure 48. Map displaying a number of upper-mantle paths to various stations from events in the Hindu-Kush region. There are many events at depths between 50 to 150 km which provides relatively simply isolated sources.
Figure 49a. Teleseismic modeling of broadband P-waves assuming a simple surface interaction, namely pP and sP, which fixes the source depth and allows relocation (Zhao et al., 1991). (Event 7/24/89)
Figure 49b. Teleseismic modeling of broadband P-waves assuming a simple surface interaction, namely pP and sP, which fixes the source depth and allows relocation (Zhao et al., 1991). (Event 5/5/90)
Figure 50. Upper-mantle models, TNA (Tectonic North America), SNA (Shield North America), TIP (Tibet), and ECH (Eastern China), after Zhao et al., 1991.
Figure 51. Vertical Component: broadband comparison of synthetics and observations where the synthetics were generated with reflectivity, restricted to periods greater than 1 sec.
Figure 52. Radial Component: broadband comparison of synthetics and observations where the synthetics were generated with reflectivity, restricted to periods greater than 1 sec.
kms, we would expect this problem to occur. Another computational difficulty, at present, is the inability to include attenuation directly into our synthetics. The intrinsic $Q$ structure for a given crustal medium can be handled in the frequency-wavenumber code. This code has been calibrated as discussed in the previous section and will be used in future studies to monitor the effect of $Q$ on broadband signals. Alternatively, we can simulate the appropriate behavior by convolving these results with a $t^*$ operator. For a world-wide average value, a $t^*$ of 1 for P waves and a $t^*$ of 4 for S waves are normally used. The later procedure is adopted in this present investigation.

A comparison of these synthetics with observations indicate some agreements and some disagreements. For example, the synthetic S waves show good agreement with the recorded data at most stations. The P wave synthetics show some inconsistencies with the data, especially at ARU 89 where the polarity is even wrong. But this much disagreement is, in overall, expected given that the source, structure and $t^*$ are not known well at this stage of modeling.

An enlarged portion of the SV-wave for the best looking station, ARU, is given in Figure 53 along with various $t^*$ operators. A $t^*$ between 2 and 3 appears to fit the waveshape the best although some adjustments in the triplications are needed to improve the level of fits.

It is generally useful to decompose the synthetics into rays so that individual pulses can be isolated and modeled, and the agreement between the data and the synthetic is improved. Figures 54 and 55 display the synthetics containing the simple surface reflections, pP, sP, and pS, sS. These three arrivals do quite well at matching the reflectivity synthetics at the nearest distances but less well as the distance increases. This is caused by the neglect of the S-P interactions in the crust or the so-called S coupled PL waves. A detailed comparison of the S-waves at OBN as generated by the reflectivity code indicates that a small P-wave precursor occurs, see vertical and radial. This is caused by the SV-to-P conversion at the crustal receiver structure. This feature has not been included in the rays at this stage. The precursor in the ray synthetics are caused by diffracted P-waves along the crustal-mantle interface.
Figure 53. Comparisons of observations with reflectivity synthetics at ARU indicating the promise of detailed fits with some adjustments in upper-mantle triplications.
Figure 54. Vertical Component comparison of synthetics with observations when the phases P, pP, sP and S, pS, sS have been generated by ray theory assuming a $t^* = 1$ and 4.
Figure 55. Radial Component comparison of synthetics with observations when the phases P, pP, sP and S, pS, sS have been generated by ray theory assuming a $t^*$ = 1 and 4.
Included in the ray synthetics is the absolute amplitudes. In many cases the synthetics assuming \( t' = 1 \) and 4 bracket the data, at least for the event with the best mechanism, namely the 90 event. The timing of the surface reflected phases in these synthetics is different than is the reflectivity run because we used deeper sources to compensate for the thicker crust, that is \( h = 102 \) and 117 kms respectively.

It is difficult to check the timing of P and S in these figures because of the mismatch in amplitudes. These features are more easily seen in synthetics where the radiation patterns have been supressed as in Figures 56 and 57. These figures contain only the down-going P and S where the sources are at their proper depths, 85 and 106 km respectively. Only the vertical component is displayed which yields the clearest arrival onsets. We have included pure tectonic style synthetics for comparison. The P-waves are slightly early for the S25-SNA model but the SV waves are early by 10 secs or more, see ARU and KIV. On the other hand, from the GCA-TNA model the SV waves are late at KIV (2 secs) and ARU (8 secs). The travel times are in general agreement with the (SS-S) times reported on by Woodward and Masters (1991) and Grand and Helmberger (1985), see Figure 58. Results from the latter study indicate a sharp increase in velocity when crossing the high ridge of topography that extends from Hindu-Kush to Lake Baikal. Velocities north of this feature appear unusually fast, essentially SNA. This study as well as the earlier report by Rial et al. (1984) used the waveform and travel times of upper mantle (SS-S) data. The results from Woodward and Masters (1991) are teleseismic type (SS-S) measurements and can contain anomalies deeper than Upper-Mantle. Whatever the reason they see much more variability in velocity structures across Russia than previously concluded, along the Ural mountain extension from NZ to the Hindu-Kush. A deep anomaly running North and South beneath the Mid United States has also been seen by Grand (1991), perhaps this is a similar feature.
Figure 56. Comparison of synthetics and observations when only the direct P and S are displayed and the radiation pattern has been suppressed.
Figure 57. Comparisons of ray synthetics (GCA and TNA) with observations. The synthetic SV-waves are now too late by 2 secs at KIV and 8 secs at ARU.
Figure 58. SS-S residuals in Eurasia. Negative residuals are indicative of faster than average velocity material, while positive residuals indicate slower velocity material, after Woodward and Masters (1991)
The most interesting events occur along the tectonic regions indicated by the topography display and are probably in slower structure than most of the Soviet stations. Thus, to model the many broadband records available would require approximateing these structures by at least 2D models.

A common method of generating synthetics for 2D models is due to Chapman (1978), called the WKBJ method. Some short-period results for models formed by a linear connection between pure models is given in Figure 59, see Helmberger et al. (1985). Five profiles are displayed showing the upper-mantle triplications. The small first arrival at ranges near 18° is essentially a lid diffraction coming from a depth of about 185 kms in the pure S25 model. The large second arrival at 18° for this model is just the "400" triplication. Since the lid velocities are slower in the TIP model a third arrival coming from a depth near 250 km is apparent in the pure-TIP synthetics. The other three profiles correspond to placing the source at various positions along the 1000 km transition zone. Profile S25-TIP is appropriate for a midpoint and the other two are mostly SNA(-500) or TIP(+500). The synthetics for (S25-TIP fits the absolute travel times at ARU quite well. The code used in constructing these synthetics have been used primarily in modeling multibounce SH waves (Grand and Helmberger, 1985; Graves and Helmberger, 1988) and discussed in detail in previous WCC reports (WCCP-R-83-01).

A new technique of generating synthetics for 2D structures is presently going through the testing process but will allow broadband modeling since diffractions and tunneling will be treated. This method is essentially an extension of the Cagneard de-Hoop method to handle lateral variations. Figure 60 displays the basic geometry and rayset for a direct P or S. Following this approach requires finding a geometrical ray parameter (po) or snell's law angle (θa) that tracks rays from the source to the receiver after reflecting from each boundary. The shallowest generalized rays contribute both headwaves and post critical angle reflections. The timing of these various rays can also be used to generate synthetics directly as suggested by Burdick and Salvado (1986).
Figure 59. Profiles of WKBJ synthetics (P-waves) assuming 2D structure. Panels S25 and TIP are pure path results where the P-waves are about 3 secs faster for SNA relative to TIP. The synthetics for a model that starts with TIP and ends with S25 fits the timing at ARU quite well.
Figure 60. Display of ray paths connecting a source and receiver to reflectors used in generating synthetics for 2D models.
In conclusion, it appears that an excellent estimate of regionalized attenuation can be constructed from broadband data. However, to obtain high resolution will require refining the propagational corrections. This appears possible by applying the latest analytical techniques to the numerous data sets, namely explosions (Garnero et al., 1992) and earthquakes (Zhao et al., personal communication).

Conclusions and Recommendations: The release of internal data from the Soviet Union obviously presents some great opportunities for solving some of the most long-standing yield estimation problems. However, interpretation of the data is still complex, and we continue to face the challenges of modeling the source RDP, determining its dependence on depth and separating source from propagation effects. Here we have focused on the influence of Q. We recommend that integrated Q, velocity and source models be developed for the Soviet Union which yield consistent values for regional and teleseismic t'. The Soviet PNE program has been much more extensive than the U.S., and intensive studies of this data should yield important new insights into source scaling. We also recommend an intensive effort to obtain near field explosion data from the Soviet Union since data of this type has proved so valuable in interpreting U.S. data.
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